UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,894	02/20/2004	Louis S. Kucera	053665-5012	4211
, - -	7590 08/11/200 VIS & BOCKIUS LLP	EXAMINER		
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW			ANDERSON, JAMES D	
WASHINGTON, DC 20004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/781,894	KUCERA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JAMES D. ANDERSON	1614	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on	the cover sheet with the correspondence address			
• •				
THE REPLY FILED 30 July 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the san application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	(1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request			
periods:				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of	the final rejection.			
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than	Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Y CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO			
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee distatutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as			
2. ☑ The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>30 July 2009</u> . A brief in compli	once with 27 CEP 41 27 must be filed within two menths of the			
date of filing the Notice of Appeal was filed off 30 daily 2009. A blief in Complication of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration 				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	·			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form appeal; and/or	for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for			
(d) $igsqcup$ They present additional claims without canceling a correspo	onding number of finally rejected claims.			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See	attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable non-allowable claim(s).				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will r how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided be The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8 and 39</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>9-38</u> .				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficience was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and wa	e <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does N See Continuation Sheet.	NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:			
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SE 13. Other:	3/08) Paper No(s)			
/Ardin Marschel/	/James D Anderson/			
	/James D Anderson/ Examiner, Art Unit 1614			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are substantially identical to the arguments presented after Final rejection on 6/30/2009. The Examiner has responded to these arguments in the Advisory Action mailed 7/16/2009, which response is herein incorporated by reference. The Examiner remains unpersuaded that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to use compounds of Formula I as recited in the instant claims to treat respiratory syncytial virus. The cited prior art teaches the use of related compounds to treat "viral infections", including RSV, and Kucera II teaches that compounds encompassed by the instant claims have anti-viral activity as suggested by Kucera I. Applicants have presented no factual evidence that the claimed sub-genus of compounds has biological properties that are not also possessed by the broader genus of compounds disclosed in Kucera I (i.e., Applicants have provided no evidence that compounds of Kucera I wherein X is C6-C14 are not anti-RSV agents, whereas compounds of Formula I wherein X is C1-C5 alkyl do possess anti-RSV properties). In the absence of such factual evidence, the rejection of claims 1-8 and 39 remains proper.